



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.   | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| 10/691,534  | 10/24/2003  | Volker Sauermann     | 07781.0112-00         | 6883             |
| 22852   | 7590        | 04/04/2006           | EXAMINER              |                  |
| FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER<br>LLP<br>901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW<br>WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413 |             |                      | CHAKRABORTY, SUPRATIK |                  |
|   |             |                      | ART UNIT              | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   |             |                      | 2628                  |                  |

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                              |   |  |  |
|------------------------------|---|--|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/691,534    | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>SAUERMANN, VOLKER |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>Supratik Chakraborty | <b>Art Unit</b><br>2628                  |  |

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

### Period for Reply

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5,8,9,11-13,16,17,19-21,23,24,27-29 and 33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5,8,9,11-13,16,17,19-21,23,24,27-29 and 33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

**Claims 1, 3-5, 8-9, 11-13, 16-17, 19-21, 23-24, 27-29, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Hoag (US 6,313,848) further in view of Brown et al (20050005236).**

**Regarding claim 1**, Hoag discloses that the claimed feature of a method for displaying data using a window having a width boundary comprising: determining that data [i.e. "tabular data"] for a list item cannot be displayed within the width boundary [i.e. "the width of workspace"; 340] [determining the dynamic height and width of the workspace available for the display of tabular data within window...] See Abstract line 6-8, col 2 line 25-29); creating a first window [i.e. "pane"; 511] and a second window [i.e. "pane; 512]

Art Unit: 2628

based on the determination that data for a list item cannot be displayed within the width boundary; splitting [by “dividing line”; 510] the data for the list item into a first portion [i.e. columns 1-6 in Fig 5] and a second portion [i.e. columns 7-12 in Fig 5], such that the first portion will fit into the first window [“the step of dividing workspace into panes...”

See Abstract line 11-14, col. 2 line 29-36); displaying the first portion [i.e. columns 1-6 in Fig 5] of the data for the list item in the first window [511]; and displaying the second portion [i.e. columns 7-12 in Fig 5] of the data for the list item wrapped into the second window [512] [“displaying within each pane...different columns are displayed in each pane....”] (See Abstract line 14-17, col 2 line 36-38, Fig 5-6)

Hoag doesn't teach the use of first and second windows. Hoag teaches about the distribution of the data into a plurality of panes (col.4, lines 50-53).

Brown et al implicitly teaches the above limitation in (page 2, [0022]; Figure 1).

The “panes” in the context of Brown et al, can be interpreted to read upon the claimed “window” as they have all the aspects of windows.

Therefore it would have been obvious to implement Hoag's panes as windows as disclosed by Brown et al in order to independently control the two panes.

**Regarding claim 3**, Hoag discloses that the data for a list item comes from more than one data source (See Fig 5-6;col.3, lines 3-5).

Hoag in (col.3, lines 3-5) teach about a plurality of input devices. It would have been obvious to use these different input devices for the provision of data to the list item.

**Regarding claim 4**, Hoag discloses that displaying at least one column of data [i.e. “head column”; 522,523] from the first portion in the second window. (See Fig 5-6). The reference implicitly teaches the claimed limitation. One could use infuse data from one column into the other column and thus satisfy the claimed limitation.

**Regarding claim 5**, Hoag discloses that displaying a color to comprehend whether a row of data in the second window corresponds to a row of data in the first window. (See Fig 5-6)

**Regarding claim 8**, Hoag discloses that handling an event associated with the window such that the event synchronously affects the second window. (See Fig 6). The reference teaches about the panes that are scrolled in synchronization with one another (col.5, lines 30-42). The reference teaches how the scrolling of one pane affects the other and that corresponds the claimed limitation.

**Regarding claim 9**, claim 9 is similar in scope to the claim 1, and thus the rejection to claim 1 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 9.

**Regarding claim 11**, claim 11 is similar in scope to the claim 3, and thus the rejection to claim 3 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 11.

Art Unit: 2628

**Regarding claim 12**, claim 12 is similar in scope to the claim 4, and thus the rejection to claim 4 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 12.

**Regarding claim 13**, claim 13 is similar in scope to the claim 5, and thus the rejection to claim 5 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 13.

**Regarding claim 16**, claim 16 is similar in scope to the claim 8, and thus the rejection to claim 8 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 16.

**Regarding claim 17**, claim 17 is similar in scope to the claim 1, and thus the rejection to claim 1 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 17.

**Regarding claim 19**, claim 19 is similar in scope to the claim 3, and thus the rejection to claim 3 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 19.

**Regarding claim 20**, claim 20 is similar in scope to the claim 4, and thus the rejection to claim 4 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 20.

**Regarding claim 21**, claim 21 is similar in scope to the claim 5, and thus the rejection to claim 5 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 21.

Art Unit: 2628

**Regarding claim 23**, claim 23 is similar in scope to the claim 8, and thus the rejection to claim 8 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 23.

**Regarding claim 24**, claim 24 is similar in scope to claim 1, and thus the rejection to claim 1 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 24.

**Regarding claim 27**, claim 27 is similar in scope to the claim 3, and thus the rejection to claim 3 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 27.

**Regarding claim 28**, Hoag discloses that displaying at least one datum [i.e. "head column"; 522,523] from the first portion on the corresponding line in the second display area. (See Fig 5-6)

**Regarding claim 29**, Hoag discloses that displaying an aid [i.e. "a number 1-10" shown in Fig 5-6] to comprehend that the line in the first display area wraps to the corresponding line in the second window. (See Fig 5-6)

**Regarding claim 33**, claim 33 is similar in scope to the claim 8, and thus the rejection to claim 8 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 33.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments, see Page 5, filed 11/21/2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1 under U.S.C. 103 (a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Brown et al since panes are known to be sectioned windows on a graphical display.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Supratik Chakraborty whose telephone number is (571) 272-7662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (7:30 am - 3:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ulka Chauhan can be reached on (571) 272-7782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).




Art Unit: 2628

SC

S.Chakraborty

3/16/2006

  
ULKA CHAUHAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER